

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS  
35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,109), hereafter referred to as Kikinis in view of Hurtado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,812), hereafterreferred to as Hurtado. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Kikinis fails to teach or suggest "preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on said electronic device and located within said installed software," as claimed in Claim 1. In fact, Kikinis and the present invention are very different.

Kikinis purports to teach a simplified file hyper text protocol for use with handheld devices to help preserve battery life. Although the invention of Kikinis is useful for downloading web pages and transposing the web pages to a specific size for use on a handheld device (Col. 2 lines 54-57), Kikinis fails to teach or suggest "preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on said electronic device and located within said installed software," as

claimed. The limitations of the present invention provide a method for authenticating a user and preventing unauthorized access of software applications on a handheld device. Kikinis fails to teach or suggest preventing access to any type of software applications of the handheld device.

Kikinis teaches, "if the log-on is not valid, control in the Proxy-Server goes from step 65 to step 71, and the Proxy-Server disconnects from the hand-held unit (Col. 9 lines 62-64)." Kikinis teaches disconnecting the proxy server from the hand-held unit to prevent unauthorized access to the proxy server. This actually teaches away from "preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on said electronic device and located within said installed software," as claimed in Independent Claim 1 because Kikinis fails to prevent access to software applications resident on the handheld computer. Therefore, Kikinis neither teaches or suggests the claimed embodiment. For the foregoing rational, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of Kikinis. Independent Claims 9 and 15 recite similar limitations to Claim 1. As such, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Hurtado fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kikinis. In fact, Hurtado also teaches away from "preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on said electronic device and located within said installed software," as claimed.

As stated above, limitations of the present invention provide a method for authenticating a user and preventing unauthorized access of software applications on a handheld device. Hurtado purports to teach secure electronic content distribution on CDs and DVDs. This is very different from the claimed limitations of the present invention. Hurtado teaches "preventing access to this key by even the End-User(s) helps to prevent piracy or sharing of the Content 113 with other computers (Col. 87 lines 43-45)". Furthermore, Hurtado teaches "the secret user key is protected by breaking the key into multiple parts and storing pieces of the key in multiple locations throughout the End-User(s)' computer (Col 87 lines 37-40)". The key of Hurtado is never intended to be used by the user. In fact, the purpose of the Hurtado key is to prevent access to the key altogether by the end user.

This teaches away from "preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are installed on said electronic device and located within said installed software," as claimed because "upon authorized registration of said electronic device with said proxy server, allowing said web clipping applications to be made available for use by said user and otherwise preventing access of said web clipping applications by said user," as claimed. The present invention allows access to the web clipping applications after a successful registration, the

user can access the web clipping applications. Therefore, Hurtado neither teaches or suggests the claimed embodiment.

For the foregoing rational, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of Hurtado. As such, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: Aug. 3, 2004



Anthony Murabito  
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060